
From: Cat [mailto:catcampbell@sti.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2007 3:14 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

Hello,

At first I was afraid that the chain of MPAs would mean a ban on all sport and commercial fishing along the entire California coast, up to 3 miles out. Now I see that there are many areas that will still be open to fishing, especially for the recreational fishermen. It seems quite fair and a good compromise that allows everyone to enjoy the coast while at the same time offering protection to the marine resources.

Someone mentioned that fishermen might be biased if allowed to act as port liaisons, but I would imagine every person, no matter if they are pro- or anti-fishing, has a certain amount of bias when it comes to their personal opinions of the MPAs.

I don't think that fishermen, who depend on a healthy fish population not only for themselves but for future generations, would want the fisheries depleted.

As far as I have read, the port liaisons would be responsible for such things as arranging introductory meetings, identifying and contacting commercial fishermen, helping to arrange interviews and helping to gather and update existing port and community information and also to arrange meetings for the verification of results.

Port liaisons would be working with Ecotrust staff and field teams. I don't think that including fishermen to help with all this would mean that bias would be a problem. Why condemn fishermen for wanting to be actively involved in the MPA process? I think it is commendable.

I also think that we all need to remember that the MPAs are an effort to address the needs of all involved, whether it be marine creatures or humans, and strike a balance. They were not intended as a radical means to only one end, such as a total ban on all fishing, whether commercial or recreational.

Those who are totally against all fishing have a right to their beliefs, and I respect them, but those of us who enjoy fishing count, too.

Cat Campbell
North Fork CA